



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/621,045	07/21/2000	Masayuki Takayama	10112-009001 / K23-123017	4035

7590 05/13/2003

Schulte Roth & Zabel LLP
919 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022

EXAMINER

RAMPURIA, SHARAD K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2683

DATE MAILED: 05/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/621,045

Applicant(s)

TAKAYAMA ET AL.

Examiner

Sharad Rampuria

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3 & 5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 & 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jahagirdar et al. in view of Narayanaswamy et al.

1. Regarding claim 1, Jahagirdar disclosed A mobile telephone set comprising:

display means for displaying information including telephone numbers or characters
(Abstract) comprising;

a first address data bus connected to principal integrated circuits such as control means and storage means; (524; Fig.5) and

Jahagirdar fails to disclosed a second address data bus for connecting said control means and said display means independently of said first address data. However, Narayanaswamy teaches in an analogous art, that a second address data bus for connecting said control means and said display means independently of said first address data; (210; Fig.2) wherein said control means controls said first address data bus and said second address data bus independently.

Art Unit: 2683

(Col.3; 12-50) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a second address data bus for connecting said control means and said display means independently of said first address data in order to provide multiple display device that can display different subsets of image signals.

5. Regarding Claim 5, Jahagirdar disclosed A mobile telephone as claimed in claim 1, wherein said display (Fig.2; 130) means is arranged near an antenna (Fig.2; 110) of the mobile telephone.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jahagirdar et al. & Narayanaswamy et al. in view of Szczutkowski et al.

2. Regarding Claim 2, Jahagirdar disclosed all the particulars of the claim except controlled to prohibit access to said second address data bus while said communication means is receiving signals. However, Szczutkowski teaches in an analogous art, that A mobile telephone as claimed in claim 1, further comprising communication means for transmitting signals via a radio line wherein said control means is controlled to prohibit access to said second address data bus while said communication means is receiving signals. (Col.8; 7-44) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include controlled to prohibit access to said second address data bus while said communication means is receiving signals in order to transmit separately.

Art Unit: 2683

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jahagirdar et al. & Narayanaswamy et al. in view of Kubes et al.


3. Regarding Claim 3, Jahagirdar et al. disclosed all the particulars of the claim except a lower voltage. However, Kubes teaches in an analogous art, that A mobile telephone as claimed in claim 1, wherein said second address data bus is driven by lower voltage than said first address data bus. (Col. 5; 24-35) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a lower voltage in order to reduce the voltage use in LCD.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharad Rampuria whose telephone number is 703-308-4736. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu. (6:30-4:00) alternate Fri. (6:30-3:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on 703-308-5318. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

Sharad k. Rampuria
May 8, 2003


WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600